arXiv:1703.03251v1 [hep-ph] 9 Mar 2017

KIAS-P17016

Excesses of muon $g-2$, $R_{D^{(*)}}$, and R_K in a leptoquark model

Chuan-Hung Chen,[1,*] Takaaki Nomura,[2,†] and Hiroshi Okada[3,‡]

[1]*Department of Physics, National Cheng-Kung University, Tainan 70101, Taiwan*

[2]*School of Physics, KIAS, Seoul 130-722, Korea*

[3]*Physics Division, National Center for Theoretical Sciences, Hsinchu 300, Taiwan*

(Dated: March 10, 2017)

Abstract

We investigate the anomalies of muon $g-2$, R_K, R_D, and R_{D^*} in a specific model with one doublet, one triplet, and one singlet scalar leptoquarks (LQs). When the strict limits from the $\ell' \to \ell\gamma$, $\Delta B = 2$, $B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-$, and $B^+ \to K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ processes are considered, it is found that due to the strong correlations among the constraints and observables, it is difficult to use one scalar LQ to explain all anomalies. After ignoring the constraints and small couplings, the muon $g-2$ can be singly explained by the doublet LQ due to the m_t enhancement; the measured and unexpected smaller R_K needs the combination effects from the doublet and triplet LQs; and the R_D and R_{D^*} excesses have to rely on the singlet LQ through the scalar- and tensor-type interactions.

*Electronic address: physchen@mail.ncku.edu.tw

†Electronic address: nomura@kias.re.kr

‡Electronic address: macokada3hiroshi@cts.nthu.edu.tw

Several interesting excesses in semileptonic B decays were reported by experiments; they are (i) angular observable P_5' of $B \to K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ [1], where a 3.4σ deviation resulted from the integrated luminosity of 3.0 fb^{-1} at the LHCb was shown [2, 3], and the same measurement with a 2.6σ deviation was also reported by Belle [4]; (ii) the branching fraction ratios R_{D,D^*}, which are defined and measured as:

$$R_D = \frac{\bar{B} \to D\tau\nu}{\bar{B} \to D\ell\nu} = \begin{cases} 0.375 \pm 0.064 \pm 0.026 & \text{Belle [5] ,} \\ 0.440 \pm 0.058 \pm 0.042 & \text{BaBar [6, 7] ,} \end{cases}$$

$$R_{D^*} = \frac{\bar{B} \to D^*\tau\nu}{\bar{B} \to D^*\ell\nu} = \begin{cases} 0.302 \pm 0.030 \pm 0.011 & \text{Belle [8] ,} \\ 0.270 \pm 0.035 \pm^{+0.028}_{-0.025} & \text{Belle [9] ,} \\ 0.332 \pm 0.024 \pm 0.018 & \text{BaBar [6, 7] ,} \\ 0.336 \pm 0.027 \pm 0.030 & \text{LHCb [10] ,} \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $\ell = (e, \mu)$, the measurements can test the violation of lepton-flavor universality, the averaged results from heavy flavor averaging group (HFAG) are $R_D = 0.403 \pm 0.040 \pm 0.024$ and $R_{D^*} = 0.310 \pm 0.015 \pm 0.008$ [11], and the standard model (SM) predictions are around $R_D \approx 0.3$ [12, 13] and $R_{D^*} \approx 0.25$, respectively.

Another test of lepton-flavor universality is the branching fraction ratio $R_K = BR(B^+ \to K^+\mu^+\mu^-)/BR(B^+ \to K^+e^+e^-)$. The current LHCb measurement [14] is $R_K = 0.745^{+0.090}_{-0.074} \pm 0.036$ and it indicates a 2.6σ deviation from the SM result. In addition, a known anomaly is the muon anomalous magnetic dipole moment (muon $g-2$) and its current measurement is $\Delta a_\mu = a_\mu^{\rm exp} - a_\mu^{\rm SM} = (28.8 \pm 8.0) \times 10^{-10}$ [15]. If we take these results seriously, we need to extend the SM to explain these excesses. Inspired by the experimental observations, various solutions to the anomalies have been studied [16–73].

In the SM, the $b \to c\ell'\bar{\nu}_{\ell'}$ decays ($\ell' = e, \mu, \tau$) arise from the W-mediated tree diagram, whereas the $b \to s\ell'^+\ell'^-$ decays are generated by W-mediated box and Z-mediated penguin diagrams. Based on our earlier study on muon $g-2$ and R_K anomalies [68], in this work, we attempt to establish a specific model to simultaneously explain the muon $g-2$, R_K, and $R_{D^{(*)}}$ anomalies, when the involving experimental bounds are satisfied. The serious constraints include $\ell_i \to \ell_j\gamma$, $\Delta F = 2$, $B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-$, $B \to K\nu\bar{\nu}$, etc. To make the introduced effects clear, we do not scan all involving parameters. Instead, we keep the relevant couplings, which can satisfy or escape from the experimental bounds, and directly neglect those constrained and smaller couplings.

To obtain the non-universal lepton-flavor effects, we consider the extension of the SM by including scalar leptoquarks (LQs), where the LQs are colored scalar particles and couple to a lepton and a quark at the same vertex, and the couplings to the quarks and leptons are flavor-dependent and free parameters. Since the LQs can couple to fermions and charge-conjugated fermions at the same time, therefore, in addition to the possible representations of $SU(2)$ singlet, doublet, and triplet, the hypercharge of each representation may also have different choices, which depend on what quarks (leptons) or charge-conjugated quarks (leptons) couple to the LQs. Hence, in order to explain all excesses mentioned earlier in a concrete model, we need to decide what LQs are needed.

It is known that the effective interactions for muon $g-2$ can be expressed as $\bar{\mu}\sigma_{\alpha\beta}P_\chi\mu F^{\alpha\beta}$, where $P_\chi = P_{R(L)}$ is the chiral projection operator and $F^{\alpha\beta}$ is the electromagnetic field strength tensor. Since the initial and final muons carry different chirality, in order to enhance the Δa_μ and avoid the suppression from the lepton mass, the introduced LQ has to interact with the left-handed and right-handed leptons. Due to the gauge invariance, such LQ can be an $SU(2)$ doublet and its hypercharge can be determined to be $Y = 7/6$.

In addition to the muon $g-2$, the doublet LQ can also contribute to $b \to s\ell'^+\ell'^-$; thus, this LQ may help to resolve the excesses in $B \to K^{(*)}\mu^+\mu^-$. Unfortunately, the corrections to the Wilson coefficients of C_9 and C_{10} for the $b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$ decays are the same sign, where we need an opposite sign to explain the measurements of R_K, P_5', and $B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-$ decays. Moreover, when combining with the experimental limits, the involving Yukawa couplings are too small to explain the R_D and R_{D^*} anomalies. Thus, we need to introduce more LQs.

Due to the SM neutrinos being left-handed particles, the extra LQs for the $b \to c\ell'\bar{\nu}_{\ell'}$ processes have to couple to the doublet leptons. By the gauge invariance, such LQs can be singlet, doublet, and triplet. Since the $b \to c$ transition involves the up- and down-type quarks, the doublet LQ candidate is thus excluded. A triplet LQ is a good candidate for the $b \to s\ell'^+\ell'^-$ processes because the associated C_9 and C_{10} are opposite in sign. Although the triplet LQ can contribute to both $b \to s\ell'^+\ell'^-$ and $b \to c\ell'\bar{\nu}_{\ell'}$ decays at the tree level, it is found that both processes share the same LQ couplings. By considering the constraints from the $b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$ decays and $\Delta B = 2$ process, the R_D and R_{D^*} can not be significantly enhanced. Thus, besides the triplet LQ, it is necessary to consider a singlet LQ [27, 65]. Intriguingly, we will show that such singlet LQ can contribute to $b \to c\ell'\bar{\nu}_{\ell'}$ but not to $b \to s\ell'^+\ell'^-$ at the tree level. That is, the couplings of singlet LQ are safe from the $b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$

constraints. Hence, we consider one doublet, triplet, and singlet LQs to explain the excesses in this paper.

Based on the discussions above, we start to formulate the model and then study the relevant interesting phenomena. The introduced three LQs are $\Phi_{7/6} = (2, 7/6)$, $\Delta_{1/3} = (3, 1/3)$, and $S^{1/3} = (1, 1/3)$ under $(SU(2)_L, U(1)_Y)$ SM gauge symmetry; and the representations of doublet and triplet can be taken as:

$$\Phi_{7/6} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^{5/3} \\ \phi^{2/3} \end{pmatrix} , \ \Delta_{1/3} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta^{1/3}/\sqrt{2} & \delta^{4/3} \\ \delta^{-2/3} & -\delta^{1/3}/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix} , \tag{2}$$

where the superscripts are the electric charges of the particles. Accordingly, the LQ Yukawa couplings to the SM fermions are expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} -L_{LQ} = & \left[\bar{u}\,\mathbf{V}\mathbf{k}P_R\ell\phi^{5/3} + \bar{d}\,\mathbf{k}P_R\ell\phi^{2/3}\right] + \left[\bar{\ell}\,\tilde{\mathbf{k}}P_R u\phi^{-5/3} - \bar{\nu}\,\tilde{\mathbf{k}}P_R u\phi^{-2/3}\right] \\ & + \left[\overline{u^c}\,\mathbf{V}^*\mathbf{y}P_L\nu\delta^{-2/3} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\overline{u^c}\,\mathbf{V}^*\mathbf{y}P_L\ell\delta^{1/3} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\overline{d^c}\,\mathbf{y}P_L\nu\delta^{1/3} - \overline{d^c}\,\mathbf{y}P_L\ell\delta^{4/3}\right] , \\ & + \left(-\overline{u^c}\,\mathbf{V}^*\tilde{\mathbf{y}}P_L\ell + \overline{d^c}\,\tilde{\mathbf{y}}P_L\nu + \overline{u^c}\mathbf{w}P_R\ell\right) S^{1/3} + h.c. , \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where the flavor indices are suppressed, $\mathbf{V} \equiv U_L^u U_L^{d\dagger}$ denotes the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix, $U_L^{u,d}$ are the unitary matrices which are used to diagonalize the quark mass matrices, and U_L^d and U_R^u have been absorbed into $\mathbf{k}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}$, $\mathbf{y}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$, and $\mathbf{w}$. In the model, we cannot generate the neutrino masses. Therefore, we treat the neutrinos as massless particles; and their flavor mixing effects are rotated away. Since no evidence of new CP violation is found, hereafter, we take the Yukawa couplings as real numbers.

The scalar LQs can also couple to the SM Higgs via the scalar potential, the cross section for the Higgs to diphoton in principle can be modified. However, the couplings of LQs to the Higgs are different parameters and irrelevant to the flavors, by taking proper values of the parameters, the signal strength parameter for the Higgs to diphoton can fit the LHC data. Hence, we skip the discussions of this part in this paper, and the detailed analysis can be referred to [68].

According to the interactions in Eq. (3), we first derive the four-Fermi interactions for the $b \to c\ell'\bar{\nu}_{\ell'}$ and $b \to s\ell'^+\ell'^-$ decays. For the $b \to c\ell'\bar{\nu}_{\ell'}$ processes, the induced current-current interactions from $k_{3j}\tilde{k}_{i2}$ and $\tilde{y}_{3i}w_{2j}$ are $(S-P)\times(S-P)$ and those from $y_{3i}y_{2j}$ and $\tilde{y}_{3i}\tilde{y}_{2j}$ are $(S-P)\times(S+P)$, where S and P denote the scalar and pseudoscalar currents, respectively.

After taking the Fierz transformations, the Hamiltonian for the $b \to c\ell'\bar{\nu}_{\ell'}$ decays can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{H}_{b\to c} = \left(\frac{\tilde{y}_{3i}w_{2j}}{2m_S^2} - \frac{k_{3j}\tilde{k}_{i2}}{2m_\Phi^2}\right)\bar{c}P_L b\,\bar{\ell}_j P_L \nu_i - \left(\frac{\tilde{y}_{3i}w_{2j}}{2m_S^2} + \frac{k_{3j}\tilde{k}_{i2}}{2m_\Phi^2}\right)\frac{1}{4}\bar{c}\sigma_{\mu\nu}P_L b\,\bar{\ell}_j\sigma^{\mu\nu}P_L\nu_i$$
$$- \sum_a V_{2a}\frac{y_{aj}y_{3i}}{4m_\Delta^2}\bar{c}\gamma_\mu P_L b\,\bar{\ell}_j\gamma^\mu P_L\nu_i + \sum_a V_{2a}\frac{\tilde{y}_{aj}\tilde{y}_{3i}}{2m_S^2}\bar{c}\gamma_\mu P_L b\,\bar{\ell}_j\gamma^\mu P_L\nu_i\,, \tag{4}$$

where the indices i, j are the lepton flavors and the LQs in the same representation are taken as degenerate particles. It can be seen that the interaction structure from the triplet LQ is the same as that from the W-boson. The doublet LQ generates not only $(S-P)\times(S-P)$ structure, but also tensor structure. However, the singlet LQ can produce $(V-A)\times(V-A)$, $(S-P)\times(S-P)$, and tensor structures. Nevertheless, we will see later that the singlet LQ makes the main contributions to the R_D and R_{D^*} excesses. It is difficult to explain R_{D,D^*} by singly using the doublet or/and triplet LQs when the R_K excess and other strict constraints are satisfied.

With the Yukawa couplings in Eq. (3), the effective Hamiltonian for the $b \to s\ell'^+\ell'^-$ decays mediated by $\phi^{2/3}$ and $\delta^{4/3}$ can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{H}_{b\to s} = \frac{k_{3j}k_{2j}}{2m_\Phi^2}(\bar{s}\gamma^\mu P_L b)(\bar{\ell}_j\gamma_\mu P_R\ell_j)\,,$$
$$- \frac{y_{3j}y_{2j}}{2m_\Delta^2}(\bar{s}\gamma^\mu P_L b)(\bar{\ell}_j\gamma_\mu P_L\ell_j)\,, \tag{5}$$

where the Fierz transformations have been applied. By Eq. (5), it can be clearly seen that the quark currents from both doublet and triplet LQs are left-handed; however, the lepton current from the doublet (triplet) LQ is right(left)-handed. When we include Eq. (5) to the SM contributions, the effective Hamiltonian for the $b \to s\ell'^+\ell'^-$ decays is written as:

$$\mathcal{H}_{b\to s} = \frac{G_F\alpha_{\rm em}V_{tb}V_{ts}^*}{\sqrt{2}\pi}\left[H_{1\mu}L^\mu + H_{2\mu}L^{5\mu}\right]\,, \tag{6}$$

where the leptonic currents are denoted by $L_\mu^{(5)} = \bar{\ell}\gamma_\mu(\gamma_5)\ell$ and the related hadronic currents are defined as:

$$H_{1\mu} = C_9^\ell\bar{s}\gamma_\mu P_L b - \frac{2m_b}{q^2}C_7\bar{s}i\sigma_{\mu\nu}q^\nu P_R b\,,$$
$$H_{2\mu} = C_{10}^\ell\bar{s}\gamma_\mu P_L b\,. \tag{7}$$

The effective Wilson coefficients with LQ contributions are expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\ell}_{9(10)} &= C^{\rm SM}_{9(10)} + C^{{\rm LQ},\ell'}_{9(10)} \,, \\ C^{LQ,\ell_j}_{9} &= -\frac{1}{4c_{\rm SM}}\left(\frac{k_{3j}k_{2j}}{m^2_{\Phi}} - \frac{y_{3j}y_{2j}}{m^2_{\Delta}}\right) , \\ C^{LQ,\ell_j}_{10} &= -\frac{1}{4c_{\rm SM}}\left(\frac{k_{3j}k_{2j}}{m^2_{\Phi}} + \frac{y_{3j}y_{2j}}{m^2_{\Delta}}\right) , \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $c_{\rm SM} = V_{tb}V^*_{ts}\alpha_{\rm em}G_F/(\sqrt{2}\pi)$ and V_{ij} is the CKM matrix element. From Eq. (8), it can be seen that when the magnitude of C^{LQ,ℓ_j}_{10} is decreased, C^{LQ,ℓ_j}_{9} can be enhanced. That is, the synchrony of the increasing/decreasing Wilson coefficients of $C^{\rm NP}_9$ and $C^{\rm NP}_{10}$ from new physics is diminished in this model. In addition, the sign of $C^{LQ,\ell'}_9$ can be different from that of $C^{{\rm LQ},\ell'}_{10}$. As a result, when the constraint from $B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-$ decay is satisfied, we can have sizable values of $C^{LQ,\mu}_9$ to fit the anomalies of R_K and angular observable in $B \to K^*\mu^+\mu^-$. Although the LQs can contribute to the electromagnetic dipole operators, since the effects are through one-loop diagrams and small, the associated Wilson coefficient C_7 mainly is from the SM contributions.

Before we analyze the muon $g-2$, $R_{D^{(*)}}$, R_K problems, we examine the possible constraints from the rare decays. We first discuss the strict limits from the $\Delta F = 2$ processes, such as $F - \bar{F}$ oscillation, where F denotes the neutral pseudoscalar meson. Since $K - \bar{K}$, $D - \bar{D}$, and $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ mixings are involved the first generation quarks, and the anomalies mentioned earlier are associated with the second and third generation quarks, therefore, we can escape the constraints by assuming $k_{1\ell'} \approx \tilde{k}_{\ell' 1} \approx y_{1\ell'} \approx \tilde{y}_{1\ell'} \approx w_{1i} \approx 0$ without affecting the analyses of $R_{D^{(*)}}$ and R_K. Thus, the relevant $\Delta F = 2$ process is $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ mixing, in which the $\Delta m_{B_s} = 2|\langle \bar{B}_s|\mathcal{H}|B_s\rangle|$ is induced from box diagrams, and the LQ contributions can be formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta m_{B_s} \approx{}& \frac{C_{\rm box}}{(4\pi)^2}\left[5\left(\frac{\sum^3_{i=1} y_{3i}y_{2i}}{m_{\Delta}}\right)^2 + 4\left(\frac{\sum^3_{i=1} k_{3i}k_{2i}}{m_{\Phi}}\right)^2\right] \\ &+ \frac{C_{\rm box}}{(4\pi)^2}\left[4\left(\frac{\sum^3_{i=1} \tilde{y}_{3i}\tilde{y}_{2i}}{m_S}\right)^2 + 8\frac{\left(\sum^3_{i=1} y_{3i}\tilde{y}_{2i}\right)\left(\sum^3_{i=1} \tilde{y}_{3i}y_{2i}\right)}{m^2_S - m^2_{\Delta}} \ln\left[\frac{m_S}{m_{\Delta}}\right]\right] , \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $C_{\rm box} = m_{B_s}f^2_{B_s}/3$, $f_{B_s} \approx 0.224$ GeV is the decay constant of B_s-meson [74], and the current measurement is $\Delta m^{\rm exp}_{B_s} = 1.17 \times 10^{-11}$ GeV [15]. To satisfy the R_K excess, the rough magnitude of LQ couplings is $|y_{3i}y_{2i}| \sim |k_{3i}k_{2i}| \sim 5 \times 10^{-3}$. With the values of parameters,

it can be found that the resulted Δm_{B_s} are under the current data. However, Δm_{B_s} indeed can constrain the parameters which involve in the $b \to c\ell'\bar{\nu}_{\ell'}$ decays. We will discuss later how the constraint can be satisfied.

In addition to the muon $g-2$, the introduced LQs can also contribute to the lepton-flavor violating processes $\ell' \to \ell\gamma$, where the current upper bounds are $BR(\mu \to e\gamma) < 4.2 \times 10^{-13}$ and $BR(\tau \to e(\mu)\gamma) < 3.3(4.4) \times 10^{-8}$ [15], and they can give strict constraints on the LQ couplings. To understand the constraints from the $\ell' \to \ell\gamma$ decays, we express their branching ratios (BRs) to be:

$$BR(\ell_b \to \ell_a\gamma) = \frac{48\pi^3 \alpha_{\rm em} C_{ba}}{G_F^2 m_{\ell_b}^2} \left(|(a_R)_{ab}|^2 + |(a_L)_{ab}|^2 \right) \tag{10}$$

with $C_{\mu e} \approx 1$, $C_{\tau e} \approx 0.1784$, and $C_{\tau\mu} \approx 0.1736$. The $(a_R)_{ab}$ is written as:

$$(a_R)_{ab} \approx \frac{3}{(4\pi)^2} \int d[X]\ m_t \, (F_{k\tilde{k}} - F_{w\tilde{y}})_{ab} \,, \tag{11}$$

where $\int [dX] \equiv \int dxdydz\delta(1-x-y-z)$, $(a_L)_{ab}$ can be obtained from $(a_R)_{ab}$ by using $(F^\dagger_{\alpha\beta})_{ab}$ instead of $(F_{\alpha\beta})_{ab}$, and the function $F_{k\tilde{k}}$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
(F_{k\tilde{k}})_{ab} &= (\mathbf{Vk})_{3b} \tilde{k}_{a3} \left(\frac{5}{3} \frac{1}{\Delta(m_t, m_\Phi)_{ab}} - \frac{2}{3} \frac{1-x}{\Delta(m_\Phi, m_t)_{ab}} \right) , \\
(F_{w\tilde{y}})_{ab} &= w_{3b} (\mathbf{V}\tilde{\mathbf{y}})_{3a} \left(\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{\Delta(m_t, m_S)_{ab}} - \frac{2}{3} \frac{1-x}{\Delta(m_S, m_t)_{ab}} \right) , \\
\Delta(m_1, m_2)_{ab} &\approx x m_1^2 + (y+z) m_2^2 \,.
\end{aligned}$$

We note that $\mathbf{Vk}_{3b} \approx k_{3b}$ and $\mathbf{V}\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{3a} \approx \tilde{y}_{3a}$ due to $V_{ub,cb} \ll V_{tb} \approx 1$. From Eq. (3), it can be seen that the doublet and singlet LQs can simultaneously couple to left- and right-handed charged leptons; and the results are enhanced by m_t. Other LQ contributions are suppressed by m_ℓ due to the chirality flip in the external lepton legs and have been ignored. Based on Eq. (11), the muon $g-2$ can be obtained as:

$$\Delta a_\mu \simeq -m_\mu (a_L + a_R)_{a=b=\mu} \,. \tag{12}$$

As mentioned earlier that the singlet LQ does not contribute to $b \to s\ell'^+\ell^-$ at the tree level, however, it will induce the $b \to s\nu\bar{\nu}$ process, where the current upper bound is $B^+ \to K^+\nu\bar{\nu} < 1.6 \times 10^{-5}$ and the SM result is around 5×10^{-6}. Therefore, $B^+ \to K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ can give a strong constraint on the parameters of $\tilde{y}_{3i}\tilde{y}_{2i}$. Since the four-Fermi interaction

structure, which is induced by the LQ, is the same as that by the W-boson, we can formulate the BR for $B^+ \to K^+ \nu\bar{\nu}$ as:

$$BR(B^+ \to K^+ \nu\bar{\nu}) \approx \frac{1}{3}\left(\sum_{\ell'} |1 - r_{\ell'}|^2\right) BR^{\rm SM}(B^+ \to K^+ \nu\bar{\nu})\,, \tag{13}$$

$$r_{\ell'} = \frac{1}{C^{\nu}_{SM}}\left(\frac{\tilde{y}_{3\ell'}\tilde{y}_{2\ell'}}{2m_S^2} + \frac{y_{3\ell'}y_{2\ell'}}{4m_\Delta^2}\right), \quad C^{\nu}_{\rm SM} = \frac{G_F V_{tb}V_{ts}^*}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{\alpha_{\rm em}}{2\pi\sin^2\theta_W}X(x_t)\,, \tag{14}$$

where $x_t = m_t^2/m_W^2$ and $X(x_t)$ can be parameterized as $X(x_t) \approx 0.65 x_t^{0.575}$ [75]. According to Eq. (5), the LQs also contribute to $B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-$, where the BRs, measured by LHCb and CMS [76] and predicted by the SM [77], are $BR(B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-)^{\rm exp} = (2.8^{+0.7}_{-0.6}) \times 10^{-9}$ and $BR(B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-)^{\rm SM} = (3.65 \pm 0.23) \times 10^{-9}$, respectively. Since the experimental data are consistent with the SM prediction, to consider the constraint from $B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-$, we adopt the expression for the BR as [60]:

$$\frac{\rm BR(B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-)}{\rm BR(B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-)^{SM}} = \left|1 - 0.24 C_{10}^{LQ,\mu}\right|^2 . \tag{15}$$

Although the observables of $R_{D^{(*)}}$ and R_K are the branching fraction ratios and insensitive to the hadronic effects, the associated BRs still depend on the transition form factors. In order to calculate the BR for each semileptonic decay, we parametrize the transition form factors for $\bar{B} \to P$ as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle P(p_2)|q\gamma^\mu b|\bar{B}(p_1)\rangle &= F_+(q^2)\left((p_1+p_2)^\mu - \frac{m_B^2 - m_P^2}{q^2}q^\mu\right) + \frac{m_B^2 - m_P^2}{q^2}q^\mu F_0(q^2)\,,\\
\langle P(p_2)|q\sigma_{\mu\nu} b|\bar{B}(p_1)\rangle &= -i(p_{1\mu}p_{2\nu} - p_{1\nu}p_{2\mu})\frac{2F_T(q^2)}{m_B + m_P}\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where P can be $D(q=c)$ or $K(q=s)$ meson and momentum transfer is given by $q = p_1 - p_2$. For $B \to V$ decay where V is a vector meson, the transition form factors associated with the weak currents are parametrized as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle V(p_2,\epsilon)|\bar{q}\gamma_\mu b|\bar{B}(p_1)\rangle &= i\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon^{\nu *}p_1^\rho p_2^\sigma \frac{2V(q^2)}{m_B + m_V}\,,\\
\langle V(p_2,\epsilon)|\bar{q}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 b|\bar{B}(p_1)\rangle &= 2m_V A_0(q^2)\frac{\epsilon^*\cdot q}{q^2}q_\mu + (m_B+m_V)A_1(q^2)\left(\epsilon_\mu^* - \frac{\epsilon^*\cdot q}{q^2}q_\mu\right)\\
&\quad - A_2(q^2)\frac{\epsilon^*\cdot q}{m_B+m_V}\left((p_1+p_2)_\mu - \frac{m_B^2 - m_V^2}{q^2}q_\mu\right),\\
\langle V(p_2,\epsilon)|\bar{q}\sigma_{\mu\nu} b|\bar{B}(p_1)\rangle &= \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\left[\epsilon^{\rho *}(p_1+p_2)^\sigma T_1(q^2) + \epsilon^{\rho *}q^\sigma\frac{m_B^2 - m_V^2}{q^2}(T_2(q^2) - T_1(q^2))\right.\\
&\quad \left. + 2\frac{\epsilon^*\cdot q}{q^2}p_1^\rho p_2^\sigma\left(T_2(q^2) - T_1(q^2) + \frac{q^2}{m_B^2 - m_V^2}T_3(q^2)\right)\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $V = D^*(K^*)$ when $q = c(s)$, $\epsilon^{0123} = 1$, $\sigma_{\mu\nu}\gamma_5 = (i/2)\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\sigma^{\rho\sigma}$, and ϵ^μ is the polarization vector of the vector meson. We note that the form factors associated with the weak scalar/pseudoscalar currents can be obtained through the equations of motion, i.e., $i\partial_\mu \bar{q}\gamma^\mu b = (m_b - m_q)\bar{q}b$ and $i\partial_\mu(\bar{q}\gamma^\mu\gamma_5 b) = -(m_b + m_q)\bar{q}\gamma_5 b$. For numerical estimations, the q^2-dependent form factors F_+, F_T, V, A^0 and T_1 are taken as [78]:

$$f(q^2) = \frac{f(0)}{(1 - q^2/M^2)(1 - \sigma_1 q^2/M^2 + \sigma_2 q^4/M^4)}\,, \tag{18}$$

while the other form factors are taken as:

$$f(q^2) = \frac{f(0)}{1 - \sigma_1 q^2/M^2 + \sigma_2 q^4/M^4}\,. \tag{19}$$

The values of $f(0)$, σ_1, and σ_2 for each form factor are shown in Table I. The detailed discussions on the form factors can be referred to [78].

TABLE I: $B \to P, V$ transition form factors, which are parametrized in Eqs. (18) and (19).

	$B \to D$			$B \to D^*$						
	F_+	F_0	F_T	V	A_0	A_1	A_2	T_1	T_2	T_3
f(0)	0.67	0.67	0.69	0.76	0.69	0.66	0.62	0.68	0.68	0.33
σ_1	0.57	0.78	0.56	0.57	0.58	0.78	1.40	0.57	0.64	1.46
σ_2							0.41			
	$B \to K$			$B \to K^*$						
f(0)	0.36	0.36	0.35	0.44	0.45	0.36	0.32	0.39	0.39	0.27
σ_1	0.43	0.70	0.43	0.45	0.46	0.64	1.23	0.45	0.72	1.31
σ_2		0.27				0.36	0.38		0.62	0.41

With the form factors in Eqs. (16) and (17) and the interactions in Eqs. (4) and (6), we briefly summarize the differential decay rates for the semileptonic B decays, which we use for estimating $R_{D^{(*)}}$ and R_K. For the $\bar{B} \to D\ell'\bar{\nu}_{\ell'}$ decay, the differential decay rate as a function of invariant mass q^2 can be formed as:

$$\frac{d\Gamma_D^{\ell'}}{dq^2} = \frac{G_F^2 |V_{cb}|^2 \sqrt{\lambda_D}}{256\pi^3 m_B^3}\left(1 - \frac{m_{\ell'}^2}{q^2}\right)^2 \left[\frac{2}{3}\left(2 + \frac{m_{\ell'}^2}{q^2}\right)|X_+^{\ell'}|^2 + \frac{2m_{\ell'}^2}{q^2}\left|X_0^{\ell'} + \frac{\sqrt{q^2}}{m_{\ell'}}X_S^{\ell'}\right|^2 \right.$$
$$\left. +16\left(\frac{2}{3}\left(1 + \frac{2m_{\ell'}^2}{q^2}\right)|X_T^{\ell'}|^2 - \frac{m_{\ell'}}{\sqrt{q^2}}X_T^{\ell'}X_0^{\ell'}\right)\right]\,, \tag{20}$$

where the $\{X_\alpha^{\ell'}\}$ functions and LQ contributions are given by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&X_+^{\ell'} = \sqrt{\lambda_D}(1+C_V^{\ell'})F_+(q^2)\,, \quad X_0^{\ell'} = (m_B^2-m_D^2)(1+C_V^{\ell'})F_0(q^2)\\
&X_S^{\ell'} = \frac{m_B^2-m_D^2}{m_b-m_c}C_S^{\ell'}\sqrt{q^2}F_0(q^2)\,, \quad X_T^{\ell'} = -\frac{\sqrt{q^2\lambda_D}}{m_B+m_D}C_T^{\ell'}F_T(q^2)\\
&C_V^{\ell'} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{8G_FV_{cb}}\sum_a V_{2a}\left(\frac{\tilde{y}_{3\ell'}\tilde{y}_{a\ell'}}{m_S^2}-\frac{y_{3\ell'}y_{a\ell'}}{2m_\Delta^2}\right),\\
&C_S^{\ell'} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4G_FV_{cb}}\left(\frac{\tilde{y}_{3\ell'}w_{2\ell'}}{2m_S^2}-\frac{k_{3\ell'}\tilde{k}_{\ell'2}}{2m_\Phi^2}\right), \quad C_T^{\ell'} = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{16G_FV_{cb}}\left(\frac{\tilde{y}_{3\ell'}w_{2\ell'}}{2m_S^2}+\frac{k_{3\ell'}\tilde{k}_{\ell'2}}{2m_\Phi^2}\right),\\
&\lambda_H = m_B^4+m_H^4+q^4-2(m_B^2m_H^2+m_H^2q^2+q^2m_B^2)\,.
\end{aligned}
\tag{21}
$$

We note that the effective couplings $C_S^{\ell'}$ and $C_T^{\ell'}$ at the m_b scale can be obtained from LQ mass scale via the renormalization group (RG) equation. In our numerical analysis, the RG running effects with $(C_S^{\ell'}/C_T^{\ell'})_{\mu=m_b}/(C_S^{\ell'}/C_T^{\ell'})_{\mu=\mathcal{O}(\mathrm{TeV})} \sim 2.0$ at the m_b scale have been taken into account [27]. Since the $\bar{B}\to D^*\ell'\bar{\nu}_{\ell'}$ decays involve D^* polarizations and more complicated transition form factors, the differential decay rate by summing all D^* helicities can be written as:

$$
\frac{d\Gamma_{D^*}^{\ell'}}{dq^2} = \sum_{h=L,+,-}\frac{d\Gamma_{D^*}^{\ell' h}}{dq^2} = \frac{G_F^2|V_{cb}|^2\sqrt{\lambda_{D^*}}}{256\pi^3 m_B^3}\left(1-\frac{m_{\ell'}^2}{q^2}\right)^2\sum_{h=L,+,-}V_{D^*}^{\ell' h}(q^2)\,, \tag{22}
$$

where λ_{D^*} can be found in Eq. (21) and the detailed $\{V_{D^*}^{\ell' h}\}$ functions are shown in the appendix. According to the Eqs. (20) and (22), R_M $(M = D, D^*)$ can be calculated by:

$$
R_M = \frac{\int_{m_\tau^2}^{q^2_{\rm max}} dq^2\,(d\Gamma_M^\tau/dq^2)}{\int_{m_\ell^2}^{q^2_{\rm max}} dq^2\left(d\Gamma_M^\ell/dq^2\right)} \tag{23}
$$

with $q^2_{\rm max} = (m_B - m_M)^2$ and $\Gamma_M^\ell = (\Gamma_M^e + \Gamma_M^\mu)/2$. For the $\bar{B}\to K\ell^+\ell^-$ decays, the differential decay rate can be expressed as [79]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\Gamma_{K\ell\ell}(q^2)}{dq^2} \approx{}& \frac{|c_{\rm SM}|^2 m_B^3}{3\cdot 2^8\pi^3}\left(1-\frac{q^2}{m_B^2}\right)^{3/2}\\
&\times\left[\left|C_9^\ell F_+(q^2)+\frac{2m_bC_7}{m_B+m_K}F_T(q^2)\right|^2+\left|C_{10}^\ell F_+(q^2)\right|^2\right],
\end{aligned}
\tag{24}
$$

From Eq. (24), the measured ratio R_K in the range $q^2 = [q^2_{\rm min}, q^2_{\rm max}] = [1, 6]$ GeV^2 can be estimated by:

$$
R_K = \frac{\int_{q^2_{\rm min}}^{q^2_{\rm max}} dq^2 d\Gamma_{K\mu\mu}/dq^2}{\int_{q^2_{\rm min}}^{q^2_{\rm max}} dq^2 d\Gamma_{Kee}/dq^2}\,. \tag{25}
$$

Before showing the numerical analysis, we summarize the involving parameters for which are related to the specific measurements as:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{muon } g-2 : k_{32}\tilde{k}_{23}\,, \tilde{y}_{32}w_{32}\,; \quad R_K : k_{3\ell}k_{2\ell}\,,\ y_{3\ell}y_{2\ell}\,;\\
&R_{D^{(*)}} : k_{3\ell'}\tilde{k}_{\ell'2}\,,\ \sum_a V_{2a}\left(y_{3\ell'}y_{a\ell'}\,,\ \tilde{y}_{3\ell'}\tilde{y}_{a\ell'}\right)\,,\ \tilde{y}_{3\ell'}w_{2\ell'}\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

The parameters related to the radiative LFV, $\Delta B = 2$, and $B^+ \to K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ processes are shown as:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu \to e\gamma : k_{32}\tilde{k}_{13}\,, \tilde{k}_{23}k_{31}\,, \tilde{y}_{32}w_{31}\,, w_{32}\tilde{y}_{31}\,;\\
&\tau \to \ell_a\gamma : k_{33}\tilde{k}_{a3}\,, \tilde{k}_{33}k_{3a}\,, \tilde{y}_{33}w_{3a}, w_{33}\tilde{y}_{3a}\,;\\
&B^+ \to K^+\nu\bar{\nu} : \tilde{y}_{3i}\tilde{y}_{2i}\,, y_{3i}y_{2i}\,; \quad B_s \to \mu^+\mu^- : k_{32}k_{22}\,,\ y_{32}y_{22}\,;\\
&\Delta m_{B_s} : \left(\sum_i z_{3i}z_{2i}\right)^2\,,\ \left(\sum_i y_{3i}\tilde{y}_{2i}\right)\left(\sum_i \tilde{y}_{3i}y_{2i}\right)\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where $z_{3i}z_{2i} = k_{3i}k_{2i}, y_{3i}y_{2i}, \tilde{y}_{3i}\tilde{y}_{2i}$. From Eqs. (26) and (27), it can be seen that in order to escape from the $\mu \to e\gamma$ and $\tau \to \ell\gamma$ constraints and to get a sizable and positive Δa_μ, we can set ($\tilde{k}_{13,33}$, $k_{31,33}$, w_{3i}) to be small. From the limit of $B^+ \to K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$, we obtain $\tilde{y}_{3i}\tilde{y}_{2i} < 0.03$; thus, the resulted Δm_{B_s} is smaller than the current data. For further reducing the number of free parameters and avoiding fine-tuning couplings to be large, we take the scheme with $k_{ij} \approx \tilde{k}_{ji} \approx |y_{ij}|$, in which the sign of y_{ij} can be chosen to get a correct sign of C_9^{LQ,ℓ_j} and to decrease the value of $C_{10}^{LQ,\mu}$ so that $B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-$ can fit the experimental data. As mentioned before, for avoiding the bounds from K, B_d, and D systems, we also adopted $k_{1\ell'} \approx \tilde{k}_{\ell'1} \approx y_{1i} \approx \tilde{y}_{1i} \approx w_{1i} \sim 0$. When we drop those small couplings, the correlations of parameters in Eqs. (26) and (27) can be further simplified as:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{muon } g-2 : k_{32}\tilde{k}_{23}\,; \quad R_K : k_{32}k_{22}\,, \quad y_{32}y_{22}\,;\ R_{D^{(*)}} : k_{32}k_{22},\ y_{32}y_{22},\ \tilde{y}_{3\ell'}w_{2\ell'}\,;\\
&B_s \to \mu^+\mu^- : k_{32}k_{22}\,,\ y_{32}y_{22}\,; \quad \Delta m_{B_s} : (k_{32}k_{22})^2\,,\ (y_{32}y_{22})^2\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where $\tilde{y}_{3i}\tilde{y}_{2i}$ has been ignored due to the constraint from $B^+ \to K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$. Since the typical values of parameters to fit the anomalies in the $b \to s\mu^+\mu^-$ decay are $y_{32}(k_{32}), y_{22}(k_{22}) \sim 0.07$, the resulted Δm_{B_s} is smaller than the current data; however, they are too small to explain the $R_{D^{(*)}}$. Thus, we need to rely on the singlet LQ to resolve R_D and R_{D^*} excesses, where the main free parameters now are $\tilde{y}_{3\ell'}w_{2\ell'}$.

After discussing the constraints and the correlations among various processes, in the following we carry out the numerical analysis. From Eqs. (11), (12), and (28), it can be seen that the muon $g-2$ only depends on $k_{32}\tilde{k}_{23}$ and m_Φ. We show Δa_μ as a function of $k_{32}\tilde{k}_{23}$ in Fig. 1(a), where the solid, dashed, and dotted lines denote the results of $m_\Phi = 1.5$, 5, and 10 TeV, respectively, and the band is the experimental value with 1σ errors. Due to the m_t enhancement, $k_{32}\tilde{k}_{23} \sim 0.05$ with $m_\Phi \sim 1$ TeV can explain the muon $g-2$ anomaly.



FIG. 1: (a) Δa_μ as a function of $k_{32}\tilde{k}_{23}$ with $m_\Phi = 1.5$, 5, 10 TeV, where the band denotes the experimental data with 1σ errors. (b) Contours for R_K, $B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-$, Δm_{B_s}, and $C_9^{LQ,\mu}$ as a function of $k_{32}k_{22}$ and $y_{32}y_{22}$, where the ranges of R_K and $B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-$ are the experimental values with 1σ errors and $m_{LQ} = 1.5$ TeV. For $C_9^{LQ,\mu}$, we show the range $C^{LQ,\mu} = [-1.5, -0.5]$.

According to the relations shown in Eq. (28), R_K, $B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-$, and Δm_{B_s} depend on the same parameters, i.e., $k_{32}k_{22}$ and $y_{32}y_{22}$. We show the contours for these observables as a function of $k_{32}k_{22}$ and $y_{32}y_{22}$ in Fig. 1(b), where the data with 1σ errors and $m_{LQ} = 1.5$ TeV are taken for all leptoquark masses. From the results, we clearly see that $\Delta m_{B_s} < \Delta m_{B_s}^{\rm exp}$ in the range of $|k_{32}k_{22}|$, $|y_{32}y_{22}| < 0.05$, where R_K and $BR(B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-)$ both can simultaneously fit the experimental data. In addition, we also show $C_9^{LQ,\mu} = [-1.5, -0.5]$ in the same plot. It can be seen that $C_9^{LQ,\mu} \sim -1$, which is used to explain the angular observable P_5', can be also achieved at the same common region. According to the Fig. 1(b), the preferred values of $k_{32}k_{22}$ and $y_{32}y_{22}$, for which the observed R_K and $B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-$ and the $C_9^{LQ,\mu} = [-1.5, -0.5]$ overlap, are at around $(k_{32}k_{22}, y_{32}y_{22}) \sim (-0.001, 0.004)$ and

$\sim (0.025, 0.03)$. Although the latter values are at the percent level, they are still not large enough to explain the tree dominated R_D and D_{D^*} anomalies.

After studying the muon $g-2$ and R_K anomalies, we numerically analyze the ratio of $BR(\bar{B} \to D^{(*)}\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau)$ to $BR(\bar{B} \to D^{(*)}\ell\bar{\nu}_\ell)$, i.e., $R_{D^{(*)}}$. Since the introduced doublet and triplet LQs cannot efficiently enhance $R_{D^{(*)}}$, in the following estimations, we only focus on the singlet LQ contributions, in which the four-Fermi interactions shown in Eq. (4) are mainly from the scalar- and tensor-type interaction structures. Based on Eqs. (20), (22), and (23), we show the contours for R_D and R_{D^*} as a function of $\tilde{y}_{33}w_{23}$ and $\tilde{y}_{32}w_{22}(\tilde{y}_{31}w_{21})$ in Fig. 2(a) and (b), where the horizontal dashed and vertical dotted lines in both plots denote $BR^{\rm exp}(B^- \to D[\ell\bar{\nu}_\ell, \tau\bar{\nu}_\tau]) = [2.27 \pm 0.11,\, 0.77 \pm 0.25]\%$ and $BR^{\rm exp}(B^- \to D^*[\ell\nu_\ell,\, \tau\bar{\nu}_\tau]) = [5.69 \pm 0.19,\, 1.88 \pm 0.20]\%$, respectively, $m_{LQ} = 1.5$ TeV is used, and the data with 2σ errors are taken. For simplicity, we have taken $\tilde{y}_{31}w_{21} \approx \tilde{y}_{32}w_{22}$. When considering the limits from $BR(\bar{B} \to D^{(*)}\ell'\bar{\nu}_{\ell'})$, we obtain the limits $|\tilde{y}_{3\ell}w_{2\ell}| \leq 1.5$ and $\tilde{y}_{33}w_{23} > 0$. In order to clearly demonstrate the influence of tensor-type interactions, we also calculate the situation by setting $C_T^{\ell'} = 0$; the resulted contours for R_D and R_{D^*} are then shown in Fig. 2(c) and (d), where the solid and dashed lines denote the cases with and without $C_T^{\ell'}$, respectively. From the plots, it can be found that R_D and R_{D^*} have different responses to the tensor operators, where the latter is more sensitive to the tensor interactions. With the tensor couplings, R_D and R_{D^*} can be simultaneously explained.

In summary, we have studied the muon $g-2$, R_K, R_D, and R_{D^*} anomalies in a specific model with one doublet, triplet and singlet LQs. We have demonstrated that the muon $g-2$ can be singly explained by the doublet LQ due to the m_t enhancement. The combined effects of the doublet and triplet LQs can lead to $C_9^{LQ,\mu} \sim -1$, which can resolve R_K anomaly and the excess of angular observable P_5' in the $B \to K^*\mu^+\mu^-$ decays. When the constraints from $\ell' \to \ell\gamma$, Δm_{B_s}, $BR(B^+ \to K^+\nu\bar{\nu})$, and $BR(\bar{B} \to D^{(*)}\ell'\bar{\nu}_{\ell'})$ are taken into account, it is found that the singlet LQ contributions can enhance R_D and R_{D^*} to be consistent with the current measurements through the scalar and tensor four-Fermi interactions. It is also found that R_{D^*} is not sensitive to scalar interactions but sensitive to the tensor interactions; however, the influence on R_D is reversed. Our model can be tested at the collider experiments, such as Large Hadron Collider, by the LQ production and decays, in which the branching ratios are determined by the anomalies. We leave the discussions of collider signals for future studies.



FIG. 2: Contours for (a) R_D and (b) R_{D^*}, where the solid lines denote the data with 1σ and 2σ errors, respectively. Horizontal dashed lines in both plots denote the $BR^{\rm exp}(B^+ \to D^{(*)}\ell\nu_\ell)$ while the vertical dotted lines are the $BR^{\rm exp}(B^+ \to D^{(*)}\tau\nu_\tau)$. Contours for (c) R_D and (d) R_{D^*}, where the solid and dashed lines denote the situations with and without tensor operator contributions. Here we took $m_{LQ} = 1.5$ TeV.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology of Taiwan, under grant MOST-103-2112-M-006-004-MY3 (CHC).

Appendix

The helicity dependent functions, $V_{D^*}^{\ell' L,+,-}$ are defined as follows. For longitudinal polarization, the $V_{D^*}^{\ell' L}$ function is defined as:

$$V_{D^*}^{\ell' L}(q^2) = \frac{2}{3}\left(2+\frac{m_{\ell'}^2}{q^2}\right)|h_0|^2 + \frac{2}{3}\left(1+2\frac{m_{\ell'}^2}{q^2}\right)|h_T^0|^2 + \frac{2m_{\ell'}^2}{q^2}\lambda_{D^*}A_0^2\left|1+C_V^{\ell'}+\frac{q^2\,C_S^{\ell'}}{m_{\ell'}(m_b+m_c)}\right|^2 - \frac{16m_{\ell'}}{\sqrt{q}}h_0h_T^0 \tag{29}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} h_0 &= \frac{1+C_V^{\ell'}}{2m_{D^*}}\left((m_B^2-m_{D^*}^2-q^2)(m_B+m_{D^*})A_1 - \frac{\lambda_{D^*}}{m_B+m_{D^*}}A_2\right), \\ h_T^0 &= \frac{C_T^{\ell'}\sqrt{q^2}}{2m_{D^*}}\left((m_B^2+3m_{D^*}^2-q^2)T_2 - \frac{\lambda_{D^*}}{m_B^2-m_{D^*}^2}T_3\right), \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where $C_{V,S,T}^{\ell'}$ denote the LQ contributions and can be found in Eq. (21), and the dependence of q^2 in the form factors is suppressed. For transverse polarizations, the $V_{D^*}^{\ell'\pm}$ functions are defined as:

$$V_{D^*}^{\ell'\pm}(q^2) = \frac{2q^2}{3}\left(2+\frac{m_{\ell'}^2}{q^2}\right)|h_\pm|^2 + \frac{32q^2}{3}\left(1+\frac{2m_{\ell'}^2}{q^2}\right)|h_T^\pm|^2 - 16m_{\ell'}\sqrt{q^2}h_\pm h_T^\pm, \tag{31}$$

$$\begin{aligned} h_\pm &= (1+C_V^{\ell'})\left[(m_B+m_{D^*})A_1 \mp \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_{D^*}}}{m_B+m_{D^*}}V\right], \\ h_T^\pm &= \frac{C_T^{\ell'}}{\sqrt{q^2}}\left[\left(m_B^2-m_{D^*}^2\right)T_2 \pm \sqrt{\lambda_{D^*}}T_1\right]. \end{aligned}$$

[1] S. Descotes-Genon, J. Matias, M. Ramon and J. Virto, JHEP **1301**, 048 (2013) [arXiv:1207.2753 [hep-ph]].

[2] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], JHEP **1602**, 104 (2016) [arXiv:1512.04442 [hep-ex]].

[3] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 191801 (2013) [arXiv:1308.1707 [hep-ex]].

[4] S. Wehle *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], arXiv:1612.05014 [hep-ex].

[5] M. Huschle *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 7, 072014 (2015) [arXiv:1507.03233 [hep-ex]].

[6] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 101802 (2012) [arXiv:1205.5442 [hep-ex]].

[7] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 7, 072012 (2013) [arXiv:1303.0571 [hep-ex]].

[8] A. Abdesselam *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], arXiv:1603.06711 [hep-ex].

[9] S. Hirose *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], arXiv:1612.00529 [hep-ex].

[10] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 11, 111803 (2015) Addendum: [Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 15, 159901 (2015)] [arXiv:1506.08614 [hep-ex]].

[11] Y. Amhis *et al.*, arXiv:1612.07233 [hep-ex].

[12] J. A. Bailey *et al.* [MILC Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) no.3, 034506 [arXiv:1503.07237 [hep-lat]].

[13] H. Na *et al.* [HPQCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 5, 054510 (2015) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 11, 119906 (2016)] [arXiv:1505.03925 [hep-lat]].

[14] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 151601 (2014) [arXiv:1406.6482 [hep-ex]].

[15] C. Patrignani et al. (Particle Data Group), Chin. Phys. C, **40**, 100001 (2016).

[16] J. Matias, F. Mescia, M. Ramon and J. Virto, JHEP **1204**, 104 (2012) [arXiv:1202.4266 [hep-ph]].

[17] S. Fajfer, J. F. Kamenik and I. Nisandzic, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 094025 (2012) [arXiv:1203.2654 [hep-ph]].

[18] S. Fajfer, J. F. Kamenik, I. Nisandzic and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 161801 (2012) [arXiv:1206.1872 [hep-ph]].

[19] A. Crivellin, C. Greub and A. Kokulu, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 054014 (2012) [arXiv:1206.2634 [hep-ph]].

[20] A. Datta, M. Duraisamy and D. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 034027 (2012) [arXiv:1206.3760 [hep-ph]].

[21] N. G. Deshpande and A. Menon, JHEP **1301**, 025 (2013) [arXiv:1208.4134 [hep-ph]].

[22] X. G. He and G. Valencia, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 1, 014014 (2013) [arXiv:1211.0348 [hep-ph]].

[23] M. Tanaka and R. Watanabe, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 3, 034028 (2013) [arXiv:1212.1878 [hep-ph]].

[24] P. Ko, Y. Omura and C. Yu, JHEP **1303**, 151 (2013) [arXiv:1212.4607 [hep-ph]].

[25] I. Dorsner, S. Fajfer, N. Kosnik and I. Nisandzic, JHEP **1311**, 084 (2013) [arXiv:1306.6493 [hep-ph]].

[26] S. Descotes-Genon, J. Matias and J. Virto, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 074002 (2013) [arXiv:1307.5683 [hep-ph]].

[27] Y. Sakaki, M. Tanaka, A. Tayduganov and R. Watanabe, Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 9, 094012 (2013) [arXiv:1309.0301 [hep-ph]].

[28] R. Gauld, F. Goertz and U. Haisch, JHEP **1401**, 069 (2014) [arXiv:1310.1082 [hep-ph]].

[29] A. Datta, M. Duraisamy and D. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. D **89**, no. 7, 071501 (2014) [arXiv:1310.1937 [hep-ph]].

[30] A. Abada, A. M. Teixeira, A. Vicente and C. Weiland, JHEP **1402**, 091 (2014) [arXiv:1311.2830 [hep-ph]].

[31] T. Hurth and F. Mahmoudi, JHEP **1404**, 097 (2014) [arXiv:1312.5267 [hep-ph]].

[32] M. Duraisamy, P. Sharma and A. Datta, Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 7, 074013 (2014) [arXiv:1405.3719 [hep-ph]].

[33] S. Descotes-Genon, L. Hofer, J. Matias and J. Virto, JHEP **1412**, 125 (2014) [arXiv:1407.8526 [hep-ph]].

[34] W. Altmannshofer and D. M. Straub, Eur. Phys. J. C **75**, no. 8, 382 (2015) [arXiv:1411.3161 [hep-ph]].

[35] A. Crivellin, G. D'Ambrosio and J. Heeck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 151801 (2015) [arXiv:1501.00993 [hep-ph]].

[36] S. Sahoo and R. Mohanta, Phys. Rev. D **91**, no. 9, 094019 (2015) [arXiv:1501.05193 [hep-ph]].

[37] A. Bharucha, D. M. Straub and R. Zwicky, arXiv:1503.05534 [hep-ph].

[38] D. Becirevic, S. Fajfer and N. Kosnik, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 1, 014016 (2015) [arXiv:1503.09024 [hep-ph]].

[39] A. Crivellin, L. Hofer, J. Matias, U. Nierste, S. Pokorski and J. Rosiek, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 5, 054013 (2015) [arXiv:1504.07928 [hep-ph]].

[40] C. J. Lee and J. Tandean, JHEP **1508**, 123 (2015) [arXiv:1505.04692 [hep-ph]].

[41] R. Alonso, B. Grinstein and J. Martin Camalich, JHEP **1510**, 184 (2015) [arXiv:1505.05164 [hep-ph]].

[42] M. Freytsis, Z. Ligeti and J. T. Ruderman, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 5, 054018 (2015) [arXiv:1506.08896 [hep-ph]].

[43] S. Sahoo and R. Mohanta, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 3, 034018 (2016) [arXiv:1507.02070 [hep-ph]].

[44] A. Crivellin, J. Heeck and P. Stoffer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 8, 081801 (2016)

[arXiv:1507.07567 [hep-ph]].

[45] S. Descotes-Genon, L. Hofer, J. Matias and J. Virto, JHEP **1606**, 092 (2016) [arXiv:1510.04239 [hep-ph]].

[46] S. Fajfer and N. Kosnik, Phys. Lett. B **755**, 270 (2016) [arXiv:1511.06024 [hep-ph]].

[47] S. Sahoo and R. Mohanta, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 11, 114001 (2016) [arXiv:1512.04657 [hep-ph]].

[48] C. W. Chiang, X. G. He and G. Valencia, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 7, 074003 (2016) [arXiv:1601.07328 [hep-ph]].

[49] I. Dorsner, S. Fajfer, A. Greljo, J. F. Kamenik and N. Kosnik, Phys. Rept. **641**, 1 (2016) [arXiv:1603.04993 [hep-ph]].

[50] S. M. Boucenna, A. Celis, J. Fuentes-Martin, A. Vicente and J. Virto, Phys. Lett. B **760**, 214 (2016) [arXiv:1604.03088 [hep-ph]].

[51] G. Hiller, D. Loose and K. Schonwald, arXiv:1609.08895 [hep-ph].

[52] K. Cheung, T. Nomura and H. Okada, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 11, 115024 (2016) [arXiv:1610.02322 [hep-ph]].

[53] K. Cheung, T. Nomura and H. Okada, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no. 1, 015026 (2017) [arXiv:1610.04986 [hep-ph]].

[54] L. Wang, J. M. Yang and Y. Zhang, arXiv:1610.05681 [hep-ph].

[55] K. Cheung, T. Nomura and H. Okada, arXiv:1701.01080 [hep-ph].

[56] P. Ko, T. Nomura and H. Okada, arXiv:1701.05788 [hep-ph].

[57] M. Wei and Y. Chong-Xing, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no. 3, 035040 (2017) [arXiv:1702.01255 [hep-ph]].

[58] P. Ko, T. Nomura and H. Okada, arXiv:1702.02699 [hep-ph].

[59] G. Cvetic, F. Halzen, C. S. Kim and S. Oh, arXiv:1702.04335 [hep-ph].

[60] G. Hiller and M. Schmaltz, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 054014 (2014) [arXiv:1408.1627 [hep-ph]].

[61] T. Hurth, F. Mahmoudi and S. Neshatpour, JHEP **1412**, 053 (2014) [arXiv:1410.4545 [hep-ph]].

[62] S. L. Glashow, D. Guadagnoli and K. Lane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 091801 (2015) [arXiv:1411.0565 [hep-ph]].

[63] B. Gripaios, M. Nardecchia and S. A. Renner, JHEP **1505**, 006 (2015) [arXiv:1412.1791 [hep-ph]].

[64] S. Sahoo and R. Mohanta, New J. Phys. **18**, no. 1, 013032 (2016) [arXiv:1509.06248 [hep-ph]].

[65] M. Bauer and M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 14, 141802 (2016) [arXiv:1511.01900 [hep-ph]].

[66] D. Das, C. Hati, G. Kumar and N. Mahajan, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 5, 055034 (2016) [arXiv:1605.06313 [hep-ph]].

[67] X. Q. Li, Y. D. Yang and X. Zhang, JHEP **1608**, 054 (2016) [arXiv:1605.09308 [hep-ph]].

[68] C. H. Chen, T. Nomura and H. Okada, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 11, 115005 (2016) [arXiv:1607.04857 [hep-ph]].

[69] D. Bečirević, N. Košnik, O. Sumensari and R. Zukanovich Funchal, JHEP **1611**, 035 (2016) [arXiv:1608.07583 [hep-ph]].

[70] D. Bečirević, S. Fajfer, N. Košnik and O. Sumensari, arXiv:1608.08501 [hep-ph].

[71] S. Sahoo, R. Mohanta and A. K. Giri, arXiv:1609.04367 [hep-ph].

[72] B. Bhattacharya, A. Datta, J. P. Guevin, D. London and R. Watanabe, arXiv:1609.09078 [hep-ph].

[73] M. Duraisamy, S. Sahoo and R. Mohanta, arXiv:1610.00902 [hep-ph].

[74] R. J. Dowdall *et al.* [HPQCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, no. 22, 222003 (2013) [arXiv:1302.2644 [hep-lat]].

[75] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras and M. E. Lautenbacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 1125 (1996) [hep-ph/9512380].

[76] V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS and LHCb Collaborations], Nature **522**, 68 (2015) [arXiv:1411.4413 [hep-ex]].

[77] C. Bobeth, M. Gorbahn, T. Hermann, M. Misiak, E. Stamou and M. Steinhauser, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 101801 (2014) [arXiv:1311.0903 [hep-ph]].

[78] D. Melikhov and B. Stech, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 014006 (2000) [hep-ph/0001113].

[79] C. H. Chen and C. Q. Geng, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 094018 (2002) [hep-ph/0209352].